SYNOPSIS

ON

ANTECEDENTS AND OUTCOMES OF EMPLOYEE SILENCE AMONG ORGANIZATIONS- A STUDY OF NORTH INDIA

Submitted for registration to

Doctor of Philosophy

In

Business Management

Research Supervisor :

Dr. Dalbir Singh

Submitted By:

Purvashi

Roll. No.-190100090148

HARYANA SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

GURU JAMBHESHWAR UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY, HISAR-125 001 (HARYANA)

(October , 2020)

Name of the student : **Purvashi**

Roll Number : **190100090148**

Name of the Department : **Haryana School of Business**

Subject : **Business Management**

Name of the Supervisor : **Dr Dalbir Singh**

1. TOPIC OF THE RESEARCH

Antecedents and outcomes of employee silence among organisations- A study in organisations of North India.

2. INTRODUCTION

Employees are the important resource of an organization. Employees often have ideas, information, and opinions for constructive ways to improve work and work organizations. Classical theory of organization contemplated human being as an economic man but it is not pertinent to the current work environment. People are expressing their perception, thoughts, experience, emotions, and attitudes about the work and organization through divulging using multimedia and other gadgets. At the same time, many employees in an organization may be incapable of expressing their feelings or emotions in any manner, due to its management policies or other reasons. They withdraw themselves from commenting about the function or drawbacks of the organization in which they are working. Sometimes these employees exercise voice and express their ideas, information, and opinions; and other times they engage in silence and withhold their ideas, information, and opinions. In many cases, they choose the safe response of silence, withholding input that could be valuable to others or thoughts that they wish they could express. Researchers have referred to this as employee silence (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001). When the system reinforces silence, the diverse viewpoints, opinions, preferences, and goals that may exist within the organization are not likely to be given voice and, hence, will not enter into the processes by which the organization establishes objectives, decides on appropriate courses of action, and attempts to learn from experience (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). The subject of why employees either decide to speak or not in an organizational situation is of monumental significance. During the 1980's, silence and voice were studied through the lens of justice theory. Issues of fairness and mechanisms of voice in organizational settings were the main focus. The exposure of corporate scandals and ethics

violations brought a scholarly focus on whistle blowing and boat rocking. In the 1990's, scholars continued to focus on voice mechanisms and it was not until the year 2000, as a result of Morrison and Milliken's highly publicized article in the Academy of Management Review, that scholars began to focus on the relation between management practices, organizational policies and silence and other antecedents to a "climate of silence" (Bagheri et al., 2012).

The present review paper includes 50 studies relating to 17 specific countries and 1 study having comparison with different nations. The following table shows the number of studies done in different countries:

Sr no.	Country Name	Reviews
1.	Canada	1
2.	Chile	1
3.	China	1
4.	Egypt	1
5.	Finland	1
6.	Germany	2
7.	Greece	2
8.	India	5
9.	Iran	1
10.	Italy	1
11.	Nigeria	1
12.	Pakistan	1
13.	Poland	1
14.	South Korea	5
15.	Taiwan	1
16.	Turkey	3
17.	United States	5

18.	Cross Country	1

19.	Conceptual	13

3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Conceptualizing Employees Silence as Multi-Dimensional Construct

The subject of silence in the organization has garnered little attention as silence can be described as an 'absence of a behaviour' and it is seemingly more difficult to learn about this as opposed to an obvious behaviour (Dyne et al., 2003). (Morrison & Milliken, 2000) used the term "Organizational silence" that is perceived to be organizational level phenomenon. (Pinder & Harlos, 2001) viewed the silence as an individual phenomenon and used the term "employee silence". Employee silence is different from organizational silence, the former occurs at an individual level the latter occurs at organizational level (Pinder & Harlos, 2001). Morrison and Milliken (2000) proposed that when most members of an organization choose to keep silent about organizational matters, silence becomes a collective behavior, which is referred to as organizational silence. According to Pinder and Harlos (2001) silence is a conscious, active and purposeful behavior. They defined employee silence "…as the withholding of any form of genuine expression about the individual's behavioral, cognitive and/or affective evaluations of his or her organizational circumstances to persons who are perceived to be capable of effecting change or redress." Employee silence offers an individual-focused lens assessing how individual employees withhold information on work problems to persons who are perceived capable of effecting redress (Hickland et al., 2020).

This section presents multi-dimensional understanding of employee silence given by various researchers in our study.

Acquiescent Silence – This silence is as a result of complete acceptance of organisational situations and with a limited view that there could be alternatives (Pinder & Harlos, 2001, Milliken et al., 2003). Employees do not speak up as they believe that their opinion is not wanted or valued by their management and executives and this is exacerbated by work climates that promote conformity and where any disagreement expressed is frowned upon (Knoll & van Dick,

2013). Knoll and van Dick (2013) argue that acquiescent silence epitomizes disengaged behaviour of employees as they have given up all hope of improvement.

Quiescent (Defensive) Silence – This type of silence constitutes the act of withholding relevant information due to fear and the need to protect oneself (Pinder & Harlos, 2001, Milliken et al., 2003). This fear is said to arise from employee's experience or knowledge of management strongly discouraging this kind of communication and the fear of possible termination (Pirie, 2016). Under this form of silence, employees find that they disagree with certain actions taken within the firm and possibly have alternative ideas or solutions but feel that self-preservation is more important as they would like to continue working in the organisation or have little choice (Knoll & Van Dick, 2013).

Prosocial Silence – Dyne et al. (2003) contended that often employees withheld ideas, opinions and information in the workplace with the intention that their silence would benefit other people or the organisation itself hence their actions are deemed altruistic or co-operative. Employees that have been found to engage in this silence for various reasons including the strong need for affiliation; maintaining their social capital with colleagues; protecting their social identity as well as a personality inclined to altruistic behaviour (Knoll & van Dick, 2013).

Opportunistic Silence – This type of silence arises when employees deliberately withhold information in order to gain an advantage for themselves (Rai & Agarwal, 2017). Reasons for employees engaging in this behaviour have been found to include avoiding additional work tasks and the preservation of power and status (Knoll & van Dick, 2013).

(Brinsfield, 2013) proposed a new classification of silence based on the supervisor-subordinate relationship. The six types of silence he outlined are as follows: **deviant silence** – not giving all the necessary information**; relational silence** – not wanting to damage a relationship; **defensive silence** –similar to quiescent silence; **diffident silence** – silence resulting from self-doubt or a lack of self-confidence; **ineffectual silence** – similar to acquiescent silence, a feeling of resignation or an acceptance of one's circumstances; and **disengaged silence** – a lack of concern.

(Jain, 2015) proposed a four major dimensions of silence in India namely; fear of retaliation (same as defensive silence), internal motivation, self-competence and self-image as the possible causes of silence.

Dialectics of choice to remain Silent

Organizational silence is an outcome that owes its origins to managers' fear of negative feedback and a set of implicit beliefs often held by managers (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). (Milliken et al., 2003) pointed to a variety of personal characteristics (lack of experience and low position), organizational characteristics (hierarchal structure and unsupportive culture), and relationship characteristics (unsupportive style and lack of closeness) that affected their decision to remain silent. (Pinder & Harlos, 2001) identified two form of silence namely acquiescent silence that is stimulated by feelings of resignation and quiescent silence that is stimulated by emotions such as fear/anger, cynicism and despair but (Edwards et al., 2009) revealed that anticipatory fear, shame and regret predict decisions to remain silent. In the work of (Morrison, 2014), she identified Individual dispositions (such as achievement orientation), Job and organizational attitudes and perceptions (such as powerlessness and detachment), Emotions (such as fear, futility, image and career risks) and abusive leadership that can cause a climate of silence in an organization. (Dyne et al., 2003) identified a new dimension of silence as Pro-social silence that is related to withholding work-related ideas, information, or opinions with the goal of benefiting other people or the organization – based on altruism or cooperative motives. (Donaghey et al., 2011) highlighted the ways in which management, through agenda-setting and institutional structures, can perpetuate silence over a range of issues, thereby organizing employees out of the voice process. sometimes subordinates don't speak because they assume that authorities have superior knowledge or the right to operate without question based on their position, or because subordinates do not even think about offering ideas or questions, this behavior could be due to obedience environment in the organization (Gephart et al., 2009). Among the antecedents of silence, cultural values and managerial practices have substantial influence(Rhee et al., 2014). Silence may be result of fear of reprisals for speaking out, loss of reputation if shown to be wrong, or looking stupid, silly, trite, or in a fringe minority; apathy in regards to the issue, employer, or outcome; lack of confidence in one's understanding or reasoning; and maybe simply feeling un-informed (Haskins & Freeman, 2015). Guided by the prospect theory, (Zhan, 2020) proposed that employees' silence decision-making processes undergo three phases: (1) editing; in this phase factors such as self-esteem and organizational culture set up reference points or structure ways of thinking of how to interpret anticipated outcomes of silence, (2) evaluating; in this stage employees evaluate the value and probabilities of the anticipated

outcomes and come up with the expected utility of silence at the individual, relational, and organizational level, (3) comprehensive evaluating; self-construal and organizational commitment interact during this stage to allow a salient level to emerge for final decision-making whether to remain silent or not.

Workforce bullying, in the Indian context, has emerged as significant factor igniting silence culture in the organizations. As indicated by (Rai & Agarwal, 2018), workforce bullying has significant positive influence on defensive, relational and ineffectual silence. Whereas in their previous study (Rai & Agarwal, 2017) highlighted bystanders' reactions to bullying indicating that majority had preferred silence when they witnessed bullying.

Lack of trust in organization and in supervisors leads to acquiescent and defensive silence(Dedahanov & Rhee, 2015), in addition to these lack (Nikolaou et al., 2011) found lack of trust in top management as a significant factor that positively affects employees silence behavior and the result indicated that trust in organization was found to be the strongest predictor of employees silence behavior. Higher power distance and collectivism has significant positive relation with relational silence (Dedahanov et al., 2016). (Rhee et al., 2014) results revealed that power distance and Collectivism induced acquiescent silence; however, power distance did not have any impact on defensive silence whereas punishment increased defensive silence. The perceived lack of top management and supervisor's openness to voice and lack of communication opportunities have significant impact on employee's silence behavior (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). (Dedahanov et al., 2016) findings suggest that punishment is positively related with silence. This means that when employees are transferred to a different position or unit and are placed on probation for their inappropriate actions, they are more likely to be reluctant to share their opinions and disagreements on work related issues. Organizational ethical climate can also have its influence on employee silence behaviors. As such instrumental climate had positive association with acquiescent silence whereas caring climate and independence climate had a negative association with both acquiescent silence and defensive silence when study conducted in 24 high tech firms of Taiwan (Wang & Hsieh, 2013). Whereas when procedural justice climate was higher, the effects of antecedents that inhibit employee silence (e.g., workgroup identification, professional commitment) were stronger (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008).

Effects of Silence on Organization and Employees

Organization Effects

Employees are regarded as major sources of change, creativity, learning, and innovation, which are factors critical to the success of organizations (Huang et al., 2005). Employee silence may give rise to feelings of humiliation, anger and bitterness that can harm each interaction within an organization and ultimately diminish creativity and productivity (Maqbool et al., 2019). The extent to which employees express their views or remain silent is perhaps the most important determinant of an organization's level of success (Jung & Yoon, 2019). Employee silence is extremely detrimental to organizations often causing job dissatisfactions among employees (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005), which manifests itself in turnover intentions and poor performance (Morrison, 2014). Sometimes employees silence may facilitate high profile disasters, such as the Space Shuttle Challenger explosion in the year 1986 (Whiteside & Barclay, 2013) and can lead to negative discretionary behaviors among an organization's members (Jung & Yoon, 2019). Organizational silence may have a negative impact on the process of change since "hard" truths, alternative views, or negative feedback are not easily "heard" or taken into consideration (Nikolaou et al., 2011). It makes employees suspicious of one another and the management, subsequently making them withdraw from the job and related plans. The resultant employee apathy generates emotional exhaustion which also produces employee job dissatisfaction (Fapohunda, 2016). Organization silence also has pernicious effects on organizational decision making, organizational change process and error detection & correction process (Fapohunda, 2016; Morrison & Milliken, 2000). In contrast to western studies, (Jain, 2015) found that Silence can play a instrumental role in receiving supervisory support and in regulating satisfaction within the workplace in Indian organizational work culture as Silence can facilitates the receipt of affection from supervisors that helps in regulating their satisfaction and long-term stay in the organization.

Communication is the key to an organization's success. If employee silence does occur, communication suffers and as a result harms the overall functioning of the organization (Bagheri et al., 2012). "Employee silence is killing innovation and perpetuating poorly planned projects that lead to defective products, low morale and a damaged bottom line" (Pentilla, 2003). Employee silence negatively affects innovative work behavior, but when there is a high level of perceived time pressure at work, the relationship between employee silence and Innovative work

behavior is less negative than when perceived time pressure is low (Maqbool et al., 2019). Silence behavior exhibited by public employees can have disastrous effects on public organizations as silence of public employees' places government organizations at risk, by increasing the likelihood that errors go undetected, facilitating ethical lapses, hindering innovation and slowing organizational change (Hassan et al., 2019).

Employees who are provided enough independence to voice their concerns, ultimately experience higher level of commitment. Hence, it goes without saying that a satisfying relationship between employers can only be achieved when a supportive work environment is created where employees can voice their opinions freely; it creates avenues for development of mutual satisfaction, healthy interdependence and commitment among employees (Jena et al., 2017).

Effects on Employees

Most people assume that employee silence only hurts the organization, but realistically it hurts both the organization and the employees. Employee silence also has many effects on the employees themselves. Indifferent employees, often products of ignored employee silence, tend to feel like cogs at machinery factories, developing the attitude "to get along, go along" (Bagheri et al., 2012). stress that is caused by silence is triggered from the belief that the employees' needs to share their concerns are not satisfied. Moreover, when employees need for speaking up is not satisfied, those employees may experience a gap between their beliefs and behavior because what they think is different from what they do (Dedahanov et al., 2016). When individuals cannot express their opinions because of punishment or lack the opportunity to communicate with their superiors or peers, their need to speak up and express their opinions and disagreements on work-related issues remains unsatisfied. Eventually, those individuals experience stress (Dedahanov et al., 2016) and capacitate self- censorship (Tiitinen, 2020). The findings of (Dedahanov et al., 2016) suggest that power distance and collectivism in the organizations induce relational silence and henceforth relational silence increases stress , depression and other health problems (Fapohunda, 2016). Individuals who conceal information based on the disengagement from organizational issues and who have low self-efficacy to make change are less likely to be committed to their organization (Dedahanov & Rhee, 2015). Employee silence impinges on the personal happiness of employees, and makes them to encounter psychological

challenges, and inability to see the prospect of change (Fapohunda, 2016). Perceived climate of silence in the organization and employee silence behavior leads to employee dissatisfaction and low organizational commitment on part of employees (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). In addition, Acquiescent and quiescent silence leads to emotional exhaustion, psychological and physical withdrawal (Whiteside & Barclay, 2013). The adverse effects of employee silence can be direct as well as indirect. Employee silence directly affects work by reducing managerial access to critical information and indirectly affects work by influencing employee wellbeing (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008).

Contrary to the findings of studies conducted in Western countries, but in Indian context (Jain, 2015) found that employee silence was related to increased job satisfaction among Indian workers. He argued that Indian employees strategically used silence to protect their interests and gain desired work outcomes. While prior research suggests silence contributes to job burnout (Knoll et al., 2019; MOHSENI et al., 2016) because it reduces self-expression, individuals with high EI may be able to reduce these negative effects (Srivastava et al., 2019). High-EI subordinates may strategically choose silence to curry favor with supervisors while avoiding possible conflict and stress, thereby conserving their resources. Silence may give employees an opportunity to think before making an emotional response. While Indian workers with high emotional intelligence may use silence as a strategic tool to gain personal benefits, their organizations may suffer if important information is not communicated (Srivastava et al., 2019).

The collected studies were arranged and analyzed using already identified factors and some factors were also emerged during the analysis process. The arrangement of selected studies and their classification were presented in meta-analysis preview in below table.

Study	**Country, Design, Subjects**	**Aim**	**Main Results**	**Type of analysis**	**Construct (reference for scale used, Cronbach's alpha, mean and standard deviation)**	**Correlations with silence (value, p-value)**	**Moderators**
1.(Madrid et al., 2015)	Chile, Cross-sectional & Longitudinal, Business/management (36%), civil engineer (46%), other occupation (18%) (n=342, males 81.8%, mean age 35.09 years old)	To determine the effect of Low-activated and High-activated negative core affect on employee silence. To minimize the employee silence via moderating Rumination and Problems-solving demand.	. Low-activated and High-activated negative core affect is not significantly related with employee silence. . The positive relation between low-activated negative core affect becomes stronger when Rumination is high than when it low. . The three-factor solution defined by silence, low-activated negative affect, and high-activated negative affect showed appropriate goodness-of-fit, $\chi 2 = 122.28$, $df = 51$, $p = .00$ (RMSEA = .06; SRMR = .04; CFI = .94; TLI = .93).	Pearson's correlation coefficients, two-level hierarchical linear model.	Employee Silence (ES) (Detert and Edmondson's ,2011), Job-Related negative Core Affect (Warr et al. 2014), 1 Low-activated 2 High-activated Rumination (Treynor et al. ,2003) problem-solving demands (Wall et al., 1996).	ES = 0.50 ($p<0.01$) ES = 0.16 ($p<0.01$) ES = 0.09 ($p>0.05$) ES = -0.05 ($p>0.05$)	. Rumination . Problem-solving demands
2 (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008)	U.S, Cross-sectional, nurses (n=606, 95% females, 98.6% Caucasian, mean age 41.2 years (S.D=11.05)	To investigate the effect of group-level predictor (procedural justice climate) and individual-level predictors (workforce identification, professional commitment, individual procedural justice perceptions and perceived supervisory status) on employee silence.	The study has found that procedural justice climate moderated the effects of individual-level antecedents of employee silence. Specifically, when procedural justice climate was higher, the effects of antecedents that inhibit employee silence (workforce identification and professional commitment) were stronger. The five-factor model demonstrated good fit to data ($\chi 2 = 633.37$; $\chi 2/df = 2.62$; IFI = .96; CFI = .95; RMSEA = .052). Further, chi-square difference tests indicated that this five-factor model was a	Pearson's correlation coefficients, hierarchical linear model	Employee Silence (ES) (Van Dyne et al. 2003) Workforce identification (Mael and Ashforth's 1992) Professional Commitment (meyer et al. 1993) Individual procedural justice perceptions (Niehoff and Moorman's 1993) Perceived status of the supervisor (Eisenberger et al. 2002) procedural justice climate (aggregation of each participation individual	ES = -0.14 ($p<0.01$) ES = -0.18 ($p<0.01$) ES = -0.13 ($p<0.01$) ES = -0.01 ($p>0.05$)	procedural justice climate

			better fit to data than plausible alternative models		procedural justice perception)		
3(Nikolaou et al., 2011)	Greece, IT professionals, n=327 in S1, n=285 in S2 senior (4.3% in S1 & 11.6% in S2), middle managers (18.5% in S1 & 13.2% in S2), IT specialists (48.4% in S1 & 42.2% in S2), other positions (28.8% in S1 & 33% in S2). S1 = Study 1 S2 = Study 2	The study aims at exploring the role of organizational silence and trust (trust in organization, trust in leadership, trust in supervision) on employee attitudes (i.e. organizational commitment and employee satisfaction) in a post-merger stage.	The results show that organizational trust is negatively related to organizational silence and positively to merger attitudes. Further, the significant role of organizational silence in a post-merger state was also identified through the negative relationships with merger attitudes, but mainly through the significant mediating effect of silence between organizational trust and merger attitudes. The three types of organizational trust predict a significant percentage of silence's variance (up to 38 percent in study 2).	Pearson's correlation coefficients, hierarchical linear model, multiple linear regression, a post-hoc factor analysis (Haman's single-factor test) for the possibility of common method variance problem (Podsakoff et .al 2003)	Organizational Silence (OS) (self-developed for the study, $\alpha = 0.81$ in S1 and $\alpha = 0.87$ in S2) Organizational trust (self-developed) 1. Trust in organization ($\alpha = 0.83$ in S1, $\alpha = 0.89$ in S2) 2. Trust in Leadership ($\alpha = 0.86$ in S1 and $\alpha = 0.83$ in S2) 3. Trust in Supervision ($\alpha = 0.92$ in S1 and 0.93 in S2) Organizational Commitment (Porter et al. 1974, $\alpha = 0.77$ in S1 and $\alpha = 0.81$ in S2) Employee satisfaction (Hackman and Oldham, 1980. $\alpha = 0.85$ in S1 and $\alpha = 0.91$ in S2)	OS = -0.45 ($p<0.05$) OS = -0.38 ($p<0.01$) OS = -0.45 ($p<0.01$) OS = -0.61 ($p<0.01$) OS = -0.65 ($p<0.01$)	Organizational Silence
4 (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005)	Greecce, technology sector, (n=677), technical deptt. (24.9%), customer services (34.4%), sales deptt (10.1%), accounts (3.6%), others (16.8%).	To investigate the effects of dimension of silence (Top management attitude to silence, Supervisor's attitude to silence and communication opportunities) on employee silence behaviour and on job attitudes (organizational commitment and job satisfaction).	Results indicate that supervisors' attitudes to silence, top management attitudes to silence and communication opportunities are associated and predict employees' silence behaviour. These three dimensions are also associated with organisational commitment and job satisfaction. The results of the regression analysis showed that supervisors' attitudes to silence is the strongest predictor of employees' silence behaviour (R^2 =0.135, p <0.00), followed by top management attitudes to silence (R^2 = 0.037, p< 0.00) and communication opportunities (R^2=0.009, p< 0.00).	Pearson's correlation coefficients, hierarchical linear analysis.	Employee silence (ES) behaviour (developed for the study) $\alpha = 0.87$, mean (S.D) = 3.58 (0.83) Top management attitude to silence (developed for the study) $\alpha = 0.84$, mean (S.D) = 3.32 (0.81) Supervisor's attitude to silence (developed for the study) $\alpha = 0.89$, mean (S.D) = 3.46 (0.94) Communication opportunities (developed for the study) $\alpha = 0.75$, mean (S.D) = 2.98 (0.75) Organizational commitment (Porter et al. 1974) $\alpha = 0.79$, mean (S.D) = 3.16 (0.74) Job satisfaction (Hackman and Oldham) $\alpha = 0.76$, mean (S.D) = 3.25 (0.83)	ES = 0.348 ($p<0.01$) ES = 0.368 ($p<0.01$) ES= 0.151 ($p<0.01$) ES= 0.215 ($p<0.01$) ES= 0.316 ($p<0.01$)	Employee Silence Behavior

5 (Adamska & Jurek, 2017)	Poland, various organizations, n=1044 from 8 different samples. The mean age (S.D) ranged 26.8 (2.7) to 39.8 (10.8). The respondents held managerial and non-managerial posts, employees at the starting their career stage and MBA students.	The study examined the four forms of employee silence scale (i.e. Acquiescent, quiescent, prosocial and opportunistic silence) in the polish population	The results conformed the superiority of four-factor model with adequate internal consistency at both the scale and item levels. The Criterion related validity of the scale was established by correlating the four forms of silence with measures of emotional attitude toward organization, procedural justice, relational contract and turnover intention. The four factor model used in the study confirmed its superiority as a good fit [χ2(n=1044) = 143.67; df = 48; CFI = .99; RMSEA = .044] and significantly better fit than a uni-dimensional model [χ2(n=1044) = 504.29; df = 54; CFI = .96; RMSEA = .03]. Cronbach's α between 0.75 to 0.85 (for total sample) indicate a good level of reliability.	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, Cronbach alpha	Acquiescent silence (AS) (knoll and Van Dick (2014) α = 0.82 Quiescent silence (QS) (knoll and Van Dick (2014) α = 0.84, Prosocial silence (PS) (knoll and Van Dick (2014) α = 0.85, Opportunistic silence (OS) (knoll and Van Dick (2014) α = 0.75, Positive emotional attitude toward organization (Jurek and Adamska) α = 0.92, Negative emotional attitude toward organization (Jurek and Adamska) α = 0.88, Procedural justice (Colquitt, 2001) α = 0.90 Turnover intention (Retowski and Chiwialkowska-Sinica, 2004) α = 0.82 Relational contract (Raaeder et al. 2009) α = 0.94	QS=0.68 (p<0.01) PS=0.50 (p<0.01) OS=0.51 (p<0.01) PS=0.64 (p<0.01) OS=0.53 (p<0.01) OS=0.46 (p<0.01) AS=-0.36 (p<0.01) QS=-0.25 (p<0.01) PS=-0.04 (p>0.05) OS=-0.12 (p<0.05) AS=0.45 (p<0.01) QS=0.37 (p<0.01) PS=0.15 (p<0.01) OS=0.20 (p<0.01) AS=-0.52 (p<0.01) QS=-0.41 (p<0.01) PS=-0.22 (p<0.01) OS=-0.23 (p<0.01) AS=0.27 (p<0.01) QS=0.27 (p<0.01) PS=0.18 (p<0.05) OS=0.22 (p<0.01) AS=-0.55 (p<0.01) QS=-0.42 (p<0.01) PS=-0.29 (p<0.01) OS=-0.32 (p<0.01)	Not reported
6 (Jain, 2015)	India, participants were employees from private, public and multinational organizations. Qualitative (n=55) (interviewed the employees to know whether have experienced silence in their respective workplace), Qualitative (n=334 in S1, n=314 in S2, n=116 in S3)	The purpose of this paper was to investigate dimensions of employee silence in Indian work context with regard to the supervisors and how job satisfaction mediates the relationship between silence and turnover intention. The study also explored the relevance	Results have indicated the existence of four major dimensions of silence in India namely; 1fear of retaliation 2 internal motivation 3 self-competence 4 self-image as the possible causes of silence. Further job satisfaction has	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, CFA, EFA, Cronbach alpha, Structural equation model (SEM)	Silence (developed in the study) 1Fear of retaliation (FR) (developed in the study) α = 0.84, mean (S.D) = 2.90 (1.42) 2 Internal motivation (IM) (developed in the study) α =	FR=0.827(p<0.01) IM=0.809(p<0.01) SC=0.541(p<0.01) SI=0.596(p<0.01) IM=0.599(p<0.01) SC=0.383(p<0.01) SI=0.273(p<0.01) SC=0.124(p>0.05) SI=0.442(p<0.01)	Job Satisfaction

		of superior-subordinate relationship and self-image maintenance perspectives in Indian socio-cultural context to explain and understand the phenomenon of silence in India.	mediated the effect of silence on turnover intention. This study showed the positive impact of silence on satisfaction which is contrary to the western studies. The parameter estimates for all the indicators were found to be significant and it met acceptable levels of model fit statistics. ($\chi2$=178.54; p<0.01. GFI=0.937, AGFI=0.904, CFI=0.923, TLI=0.917 and RMSEA=0.053).		0.78, mean (S.D) = 3.40 (1.39) 3 Self-competence (SC) (developed in the study) α = 0.79, mean (S.D) = 2.67 (1.17) 4 Self-image (SI) (developed in the study) α = 0.74, mean (S.D) = 3.74 (1.57) Job satisfaction (Porter 1961) Turnover intention (Cammann et al. 1983)	SI=0.042(p>0.05) Silence=0.253 (p<0.01) FR=0.246(p<0.01) IM=0.258(p<0.01) SC=0.102 SI=0.070 Silence=-0.185 (p<0.05) FR=0.034(p>0.05) IM=0.025(p>0.05) SC=0.147(p>0.05) SI=0.052(p>0.05)	
7 (Rhee et al., 2014)	South Korea, 27 heavy-industry companies, n=628 (a response rate of 69.7%) (34.4% women and 65.6% men).	To examine the conceptualization of employee silence as delineated by Van Dyne et al. (2003) by examining acquiescent, defensive, and prosocial silence in relation to power distance, collectivism, and punishment.	The results revealed that power distance induced acquiescent silence; however, power distance did not have any impact on defensive silence. Collectivism also generated acquiescent silence but did not influence prosocial silence; and punishment increased defensive silence. The CFA model demonstrates a good fit of the measurement model to the covariances provided by the dataset ($\chi2$= 637.754, $\chi2/df$ = 1.246, p < .001, CFI = .987, GFI = .944, AGFI = .935, RMSEA = .020, RMR = .061, SRMR = .031).	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, Confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modelling	Power Distance (PDI) (Dorfman and Howell 1988) α = 0.872, mean (S.D) = 3.283 (1.159) Collectivism (Dorfman and Howell 1988) α = 0.801, mean (S.D) = 3.142 (1.155) Punishment scale (Trahan and Steiner (1994)) α = 0.923, mean (S.D) = 3.256 (1.045) Acquiescent silence (AS) (knoll and Van Dick (2014) α = 0.843, mean (S.D) = 3.379 (1.064) Defensive silence (DS) (knoll and Van Dick (2014) α = 0.778, mean (S.D) = 3.450 (1.075) Prosocial silence (PS) (knoll and Van Dick (2014) α =	AS=0.286(p<0.01) DS=0.092(p<0.05) PS=0.005(p>0.05) AS=0.301(p<0.01) DS=0.054(p>0.05) PS=0.012(p>0.05) AS=0.039(p>0.05) DS=0.384(p<0.01) PS=-0.002(p>0.05) DS=0.046(p>0.05) PS=-0.070(p>0.05) PS=0.053(p>0.05)	Not reported

					0.758, mean (S.D) = 2.685 (1.102)		
8 (KORKMAZ, 2018)	Turkey, Public Health Sector, n=120 (out of which 35% are males and 65% are females) and the response rate was 80%	The purpose of the study to determine whether there is any relation between organizational commitment (which includes Affective, Normative and Continuance commitment) and employees silence behaviour (comprises Acquiescent, Defensive and Prosocial silence) in public health sector of Balikesir's Erdek municipality of Turkey	As the findings reveals that organizational commitment affects positively organizational silence. While the Affective and Normative commitment positively affects the defensive and prosocial silence, the study shows affective commitment negatively affects acquiescent silence but there is no meaningful relation established between Normative commitment and acquiescent silence. Continuance commitment affects positively to all dimensions of silence (i.e. Acquiescent, defensive and prosocial).	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, Linear regression analysis.	Organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen 1991) α = 0.833, mean (S.D) = 3.063 (0.604) 1 Affective commitment α = 0.784, mean (S.D) = 3.123 (0.844) 2 Normative commitment α = 0.69, mean (S.D) = 3.104 (0.724) 3 Continuance commitment α = 0.715, mean (S.D) = 2.961 (0.751) Organizational silence (OS) (Van Dyne et al. 2003) α = 0.772, mean (S.D) = 2.984 (0.593) 1 Acquiescent Silence (AS) α = 0.864, mean (S.D) = 2.571 (0.930) 2 Defensive Silence (DS) α = 0.60, mean (S.D) = 3.091 (0.714) 3 Prosocial Silence (PS) α = 0.937, mean (S.D) = 3.290 (1.187)	OS=0.463(p<0.01) AS=-0.082 (p>0.05) DS=0.316(p<0.01) PS=0.569(p<0.01) OS=0.236(p<0.01) AS=-0.338 (p<0.01) DS=0.184(p<0.01) PS=0.508(p<0.01) OS=0.395(p<0.01) AS=-0.048 (p>0.05) DS=0.273(p<0.01) PS=0.466(p<0.01) OS=0.470(p<0.01) AS=0.227(p<0.01) DS=0.291(p<0.01) PS=0.351(p<0.01)	Not reported
9 (Chou & Chang, 2020)	U.S, cross sectional, 12 sales companies sales employees were the participants, n = 142(response rate was 27.23% in which 51.11% were males, 31.69% females and rest did not state their gender). Mean age (SD) =	To test the impact of employee silence, in the forms of acquiescent, quiescent, prosocial, and opportunistic silence, on employees' job self-efficacy and organization-based self-esteem. In addition, to	Results indicate that quiescent silence negatively affects organization-based self-esteem, and that opportunistic silence has a negative impact on job self-efficacy. In addition, organizational citizenship behavior toward the	PLS-SEM (Hair et al. 2013), OLS regression, Cronbach's alpha, Fornell-Larcker criterion for discriminant validity.	Organizational citizenship behavior towards the organization (OCBO) (Williams and Anderson 1991) α = 0.88 Organizational citizenship behavior towards individuals	AS= -0.349 QS= -0.256 PS= -0.388 OS= -0.416 JSE= 0.685 OBSE=0.531 AS= -0.376 QS= -0.262	Organizational citizenship behavior towards the organization (OCBO) Organizational citizenship behavior towards individuals (OCBI)

	43.07(16.07) years (n=119, 23 participants did not state their age)	examine how organizational citizenship behavior toward the organization and toward individuals mediates the direct effects.	organization and organizational citizenship behavior toward individuals fully mediate the relationship between opportunistic silence and organization-based self-esteem, whereas organizational citizenship behavior toward individuals and organizational citizenship behavior toward the organization partially mediate the relationship between opportunistic silence and job self-efficacy.		(OCBI) (Williams and Anderson 1991) α = 0.75 Job Self-efficacy (JSE) (Sujan et al. 1994) α = 0.77 Organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) (Pierce et al. 1989) α = 0.91 Employee silence (Knoll and van Dick's 2013) 1. Acquiescent Silence (AS) α = 0.88 2. Quiescent Silence (DS) α = 0.89 3. Prosocial Silence (PS) α = 0.82 4. Opportunistic silence (OS) α = 0.80	PS= -0.350 OS= -0.332 JSE=0.539 OBSE=0.505 AS= -0.614 QS= -0.439 PS= -0.637 OS= -0.621 AS= -0.711 QS= -0.593 PS= -0.666 OS= -0.606	
10 (Srivastava et al., 2019)	India, Cross sectional, seven organisations from 4 states, respondents held managerial positions, n=286 (response rate was 89%), out of which 164 were men respondents and 116 were females.	The purpose of this paper is to examine the relationship between employee silence and job burnout as well as the possible mediating role of emotional intelligence (EI) on the silence-burnout relationship.	Contrary to findings from studies conducted in Western countries in which employee silence was positively related to undesirable work outcomes, in this study, employee silence was negatively related to job burnout. Additionally, results indicated that the relationship between employee silence and job burnout was mediated by EI. These findings suggest the importance of considering country context and potential mediating variables when investigating employee silence.	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, mediated regression analysis.	Emotional intelligence (Wong and Law's 2002) α = 0.97, mean (S.D) = 45.2 (14.13) 1 Self emotion appraisal (SEA) mean (S.D) = 10.4 (3.2) 2 Others emotions appraisal (OEA), mean (S.D) = 9.2 (3.6) 3 Use of emotions (UOE), mean (S.D) = 10.2 (3.0) 4 Regulations of emotions (ROE), mean (S.D) = 9.3 (3.1) Job burnout (JB) (Maslach and Jackson 1981), α = 0.95, mean (S.D) = 64.8 (18.98) Employee silence (ES) (Jain 2015) α = 0.86, mean (S.D)	ES=0.66 (p<0.01) JB= -0.87(p<0.01) ES=0.63(p<0.01) JB= -0.83(p<0.01) ES=0.62(p<0.01) JB= -0.86(p<0.01) ES=0.64(p<0.01) JB= -0.81(p<0.01) ES=0.60(p<0.01) JB= -0.76(p<0.01) ES= -0.70(p<0.01)	Emotional intelligence

					= 32.4 (9.50)		
11 (Rai & Agarwal, 2018)	India, cross sectional, 11 Indian organizations participants, n=835 (response rate was 64%), mean age= 32years (S. D=8), Participants from junior level management were 30.8%, middle level management 60.2% and rest were senior management employees.	The purpose of this paper is to examine the effects of workplace bullying on employee silence (defensive, relational, and ineffectual silence), and to test the mediating role of psychological contract violation (PCV) in this relationship and the extent to which the mediation is moderated by workplace friendship. The aim of the study is to formulate and effectively implement anti-bullying policy.	Results revealed that workplace bullying positively correlated with silence (defensive, relational, and ineffectual silence). The hypothesized moderated mediation condition was supported as results suggest that PCV mediated the bullying-silence relationship and workplace friendship moderated this mediating pathway, i.e. indirect effects of workplace bullying on employee silence via PCV were weaker for employees with high workplace friendship. The proposed six-factor measurement model (workplace bullying, workplace friendship, defensive silence, relational silence, ineffectual silence and PCV) showed a good model fit ($\chi2$=3042, df=985, $\chi2$/df=3, GFI=0.89, AGFI=0.84, NFI=0.90, CFI=0.95, RMSEA=0.04).	Pearson's correlation coefficients, hierarchical linear analysis.	Workplace bullying (Einarsen et al. α = 0.97, mean (S.D) = 1.79 (0.87) PCV (Robinson and Morrison 2000) α = 0.90, mean (S.D) = 2.0 (1.1) Workplace friendship (WF) (Nielsen et al. 2000) α = 0.80, mean (S.D) = 2.6 (1.1) Silence behaviours (Brinsfield 2013) Defensive silence (DS) α = 0.90, mean (S.D) = 2.6 (1.1) Relational silence (RS) α = 0.95, mean (S.D) = 3.5 (1.2) Ineffectual silence (IS) α = 0.89, mean (S.D) = 2.6 (1.2)	DS=0.334(p<0.01) RS=0.091(p<0.01) IS=0.347(p<0.01) PCV=0.533 (p<0.01) DS=0.414(p<0.01) RS=0.178(p<0.01) IS=0.506(p<0.01) WF=-0.116 (p<0.01) DS=-0.074 (p<0.05) RS=0.067(p>0.05) IS=-0.130(p<0.01)	PCV, Workplace friendship
12 (Wang & Hsieh, 2013)	Taiwan, cross-sectional, participants were from 24 high technology firms. n=408 (response rate was 68%) consisting 44.4% males and 55.6% females. Mean age (SD) = 33.59(8.27) years	The aim of the study is to investigate the cross-level relationships of organizational ethical climate (consisting; Instrumental, Caring, Independence, Rules and Law & Order Climate) on employee silence (Acquiescent and Defensive Silence) with taking into the mediation effect of perceived organizational support	The results showed that instrumental climate − one type of organizational ethical climate − had a positive association with acquiescent silence, but not with defensive silence. Another two types of organizational ethical climate − caring climate and independence climate − had a negative association with both acquiescent silence and defensive silence. Rules climate and the law and code climate, the remaining types of organizational ethical climate, were not associated with either the acquiescent silence or the defensive	Pearson's correlation coefficients, hierarchical linear analysis, CFA	**Group-level measures** Ethical Climate (Victor and Cullen 1998) 1 Instrumental Climate α = 0.84, mean (S.D) = 2.79 (0.27) 2 Caring Climate α = 0.83, mean (S.D) = 3.33 (0.29) 3 Independence Climate α = 0.75, mean (S.D) = 3.47 (0.30) 4 Rules Climate α = 0.78, mean (S.D) = 3.67 (0.21) 5 Law & Order Climate α = 0.84, mean (S.D) = 3.66 (0.29)	Rules Climate =-0.42 (p<0.05) Rules Climate = 0.49 (p<0.05) Rules Climate = 0.68 (p<0.01)	Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

			silence. The results also showed that the associations of the instrumental climate, caring climate, and independence climate with acquiescent silence and defensive silence are mediated by the perceived organizational support − an individual-level variable.		**Individual-level measures** Perceived Organizational Support (POS) (Eisenberger et al. 1997) α = 0.84, mean (S.D) = 3.23 (0.57) Employee Silence (Van Dyne et al. 2003) 1 Acquiescent Silence (AS) α = 0.81, mean (S.D) = 2.26 (0.53) 2 Defensive Silence (DS) α = 0.89, mean (S.D) = 1.99 (0.51)	AS=0.31(p<0.01) DS=0.23(p<0.01) DS=0.62(p<0.01)	
13 (Dedahanov, Lee, & Rhee, 2016)	South Korea, cross-sectional, participants were from 32 heavy industry companies, n=687 (overall response rate was 67.7%) out of which 33.5% were female and 66.5% were male. With respect to age in years: Between 25 & 35 = 26.3% Between 36 & 45 = 44.8% Between 46 & 55 = 18.8% Between 56 & 65 = 10%	The purpose of this paper is to investigate the mediating role of silence as a link between punishment, communication opportunities and stress. The aim of the study was to highlights the importance of establishing organizational ombudsman system, grievance procedures and employee management meetings to mitigate silence behavior.	The results revealed that punishment and communication opportunities are significantly associated with silence. Silence showed a positive relationship with stress, and it mediates the relationship between punishment and stress. Findings also indicate that silence does not mediate the link between communication opportunities and stress. The results demonstrated that the measurement model fitted the data ($\chi2$=656.72; $\chi2$/df=1.25; p=0.01; CFI=0.99; GFI=0.94; AGFI=0.94; NFI=0.95; RMSEA=0.01).	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, Linear regression analysis.	Punishment (Trahan and Steiner's, 1994) α = 0.92, mean (S.D) = 3.25 (1.02) Communication opportunities (Vakola and Bouradas 2005) α = 0.89, mean (S.D) = 2.76 (1.22) Silence (Vakola and Bouradas 2005) α = 0.94, mean (S.D) = 3.28 (1.19) Stress (Cohen et al. 1983) α = 0.94, mean (S.D) = 3.24 (1.21)	Silence=0.15 (p<0.01) Stress = 0.09 (p<0.01) Stress=0.10 (p<0.01) Stress=0.29 (p<0.01)	Silence
14 (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2018)	Turkey, Cross-sectional, cluster random sampling, participants were from 13 university hospitals, n=913 (response rate was 70%), with mean age of nurses was 27.93 years. Participants were from different departments such as; cardiology (26%), neurology (23%), accident and emergency (13%), radiotherapy (12%),	The aim of the study is to examine the relationship between a leader's behavioural integrity and employee's acquiescent silence on the basis of social exchange theory by introducing employee's relational identification as the mediator. The paper also considered the moderating role of	The results of this study support the negative effect of behavioral integrity on employee's acquiescent silence, as well as the mediating effect of employee's relational identification. Moreover, when the level of employee political skill is low, the relationship between behavioral integrity and acquiescent silence is	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, Hierarchical multiple regression analysis.	Leader Behavioral Integrity (LBI) (Simons et al. 2007) α = 0.91, mean (S.D) = 3.23 (0.69) Relational Identification (RI) (Kark et al. 2003) α = 0.87, mean (S.D) = 3.03 (0.83) Political Skill (PS) (Ferris et al. 2005) α = 0.89, mean (S.D) = 3.66 (0.91)	RI=0.27 (P<0.01) PS=-0.13 (P<0.05) AS=-0.34 (P<0.001) PS=0.21 (P<0.01) AS=-0.30 (P<0.001) AS=-0.32 (P<0.001)	Mediator – Employee's relational identification, Moderator – Employee political skill

	gastroenterology (10%), orthopaedics (9%) and nephrology (7%)	political skill in the relationship of leader's behavioural integrity and employee's acquiescent silence.	strong, whereas the effect is weak when the level of political skill is high.		Acquiescent Silence (AS) (Van Dyne et al. 2003) α = 0.90, mean (S.D) = 3.01 (0.90)		
15 (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2019)	Turkey, Cross-sectional, cluster random sampling, participants were from 9 Turkish universities, n=793 (response rate was 88.11%). 63 percent of the department chairs were male with an average age of 42.23 years. With respect to age in years: Between 36 & 45 = 32.2% Between 46 & 55 = 38.9%	The aim of the study is to examine the relationship between a leader Machiavellianism and employee's quiescent silence on the basis of social exchange theory by introducing employee's relational identification as the mediator. The paper also considered the moderating role of psychological Distance in the relationship of leader Machiavellianism and employee's quiescent silence.	The results of this study supported the positive effect of leader Machiavellianism on employee's quiescent silence as well as the mediating effect of employee's relational identification. Moreover, when the level of psychological distance is low, the relationship between leader Machiavellianism and quiescent silence is strong, whereas the effect is weak when the level of psychological distance is high. The findings of this study suggest that educational administrators in the higher education should be sensitive in treating their subordinates, as it will lead to positive interpersonal relationship, which, in turn, will reduce workplace silence. Moreover, they should pay more attention to the buffering role of psychological distance for those subordinates with high distrust and showing silence.	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, Hierarchical multiple regression analysis.	Leader Machiavellianism (LM) (Dahling et al. 2009) α = 0.80, mean (S.D) = 3.66 (0.86) Relational Identification (RI) (Walumbwa and Hartnell 2011) α = 0.83, mean (S.D) = 3.25 (0.79) Psychological Distance (PD) (Napier and Ferris 1993) α = 0.91, mean (S.D) = 3.43 (0.81) Quiescent Silence (QS) Parker et al. (2009) α = 0.93, mean (S.D) = 3.09 (0.71)	RI=-0.35 (P<0.001) PD=0.22 (P<0.01) QS=0.33 (P<0.001) PD=-0.26 (P<0.01) QS=-0.31 (P<0.001) QS=0.34 (P<0.001)	Mediator – Follower relational identification with the leader, Moderator – Psychological Distance
16 (Maqbool et al., 2019)	Italy, cross-sectional, convenience non-probability sampling, participants were from 6 different organisations, n=608, 72.6% were male (SD=0.446)	The purpose of the study is to pin the both factors, silence (relational factor) and flow (personal factor), under the contextual influence of perceived time pressure and investigating how they simultaneously relate to innovative work behaviour (IWB)	Silence is negatively related to IWB, whereas flow has the opposite association. Perceived time pressure moderates the relationship between employee silence and IWB. Furthermore, the findings indicate that the highest levels of IWB will take place when the flow level is high, individuals are absorbed in and enjoy their work, and the level of employee silence is low,	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, stepwise regression analysis.	Employee silence (ES) (Van Dyne et al. 2003) α = 0.847, mean (S.D) = 1.87 (0.89) Flow at work (FAW) (Bakker 2008) α = 0.0.801, mean (S.D) = 4.57 (0.80) Perceived time pressure (PTP) (Putrevu and	FAW=-0.148 (p<0.01) PTP=0.102 (p<0.05) IWB=-0.312 (p<0.01) PTP=0.028 (p>0.05) IWB=0.332 (p<0.01) IWB=-0.056 (p>0.05)	Moderator – Perceived time pressure (PTP)

			enabling them to exchange ideas and obtain the necessary support and resources. At the same time, low levels of time pressure provide them with sufficient time for innovative processes to take place, ideas to be shared, and individuals to become engrossed in their innovations.		Ratchford 1997) α = 0.0.878, mean (S.D) = 4.31 (1.28) Innovative Work Behaviour (IWB) (De Jong and Den Hartog (2010) and Zhou and George (2003)) α = 0.92, mean (S.D) = 5.39 (0.81)		
17 (Pirzada et al., 2020)	Pakistan, cross –sectional, stratified random sampling, participants were from the public sector universities of Sindh region, n=333, Lecturers (39%), Assistant Professors (35%), Associate Professors (6%), Professors (20%).	The aim of the study is to investigate the influence of employee silence (ES) on work engagement (WE) via including the organizational justice (OJ) as mediator between ES and WE in the public sector universities of Sindh region of Pakistan.	Research outcomes have revealed that ES has negative effect on WE. Moreover, it is seen in the outcomes that ES has negative and significant effect on OJ. In another finding study reveals that OJ has positive and significant effect on WE. At last study results suggest that OJ fully mediates the relationship between ES and WE.	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, Linear regression analysis.	Employee Silence (ES) (Van Dyne et al., 2003) α = 0.82, mean (S.D) = 2.1 (0.61) Organizational Justice (OJ) (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) α = 0.82, mean (S.D) = 3.9 (0.52) Work Engagement (WE) (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) α = 0.86, mean (S.D) = 4.1 (0.78)	OJ= -0.55 (p<0.05) WE= -0.61 (p<0.01) WE= 0.52 (p<0.05)	Organizational Justice (OJ)
18 (Rayan et al., 2020)	Egypt, cross-sectional, participants were from Assuit university, n=365 (response rate was 98%).	The aim of this study was to test the relationship between supervisor support for silence with organizational commitment and organizational silence behavior. The study also aimed to identify the relationship between organizational silence behavior and organizational commitment, as well as the test of the mediation role of silence behavior in the relationship between supervisor support for silence and organizational commitment.	The study found that there is a negative relationship between the supervisor's support for silence and the organizational commitment. There is a positive correlation between supervisor support for silence and organizational silence behavior and a negative relationship between the behavior of organizational silence and organizational commitment. The study also found that the Organizational Silence behavior mediated the relationship between Supervisor's support for silence and the Organizational Commitment.	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, direct and indirect regression analysis, sober test used to test the mediation impact of organizational silence behaviour.	supervisor support for silence (SSS) (Nafei (2016), Brinsfield (2013)) organizational silence behaviour (OSB) (Morrison & Melliken (2000), Pinder & Harlos (2001), Vakola & Buradas (2005)) organizational commitment (OC) (fard &karmini, 2015)	OSB=0.044 (p<0.01) OC= -0.28 (p<0.01) OC= -0.32 (p<0.01)	organizational silence behaviour (OSB)
19 (Hassan et al., 2019)	US, cross sectional, participants were govt.	The aim of the study is to examine why public	Study 1 shows that the empowering leadership	Pearson's correlation	Study 1 Silence (Tangirala and	EL=-0.34(p<0.05)	Mediators = Trust in Supervisors,

	employees in both study (study1=S1, study2=S2), n=1060(S1) & 552(S2), response rate was 85%(S1), 58%(S2). Female (S1=29%, S2=25%), White (S1=88%, S2=84%), African American (S1=8%, S2=11%), Hispanic (S1=2%, S2=1%), Another race (S1=2%, S2=4%). Mean age = 43.42 years(S1), 41.13 years(S2). Average tenure 9.41 years(S1), 10.34 years(S2).	employees intentionally remain silent about problems and how to prevent such behaviour. The study further aims to develop a model suggesting how empowering leadership by frontline supervisors reduces public employee silence, by improving employee trust in their supervisors, granting employees controls over their jobs, and strengthening identification with the organization.	behaviour of supervisors reduces public employees' silence by improving their trust in supervisors, control in their jobs, and identification with the organization. Empowering leadership also has a direct association with public employee silence. With respect to the associations of empowering leadership with the three mediating variables, we observe that trust in the supervisor has a stronger relationship than the other two mediating variables. Trust in supervisors is also more strongly related to employee silence than either job control or organizational identification. Study2. The three intervening variables fully mediate the influence of empowering leadership on employee silence. The indirect effects of empowering leadership on employee silence through trust in supervisor and job control are also stronger in this Study.	Coefficients, Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)	Ramanujam's 2008) α = 0.78, mean (S.D) = 2.21(0.64) Empowering Leadership (EL) (Yukl et al. 2002) α = 0.91, mean (S.D) = 3.47(0.87) Trust in Supervisors (TIS) (Cammann et al. 1983) α = 0.91, mean (S.D) = 5.20(1.29) Organizational Identification (OI) (Mael and Ashforth's 1992) α = 0.88, mean (S.D) = 5.22 (1.36) Job Control (JC) (Aiken and Hage's 1966) α = 0.79, mean (S.D) = 5.01(1.36) Study 2 Silence (Tangirala and Ramanujam's 2008) α = 0.79, mean (S.D) = 2.18(0.68) Empowering Leadership (EL) (Yukl et al. 2002) α = 0.88, mean (S.D) = 3.28(0.88) Trust in direct Supervisors (TDS) (Cammann et al. 1983) α = 0.95, mean (S.D) = 5.72(1.36) Organizational Identification (OI) (Mael and Ashforth's 1992) α = 0.89, mean (S.D) = 5.26(1.37) Job Control (JC) (Aiken and Hage's 1966) α = 0.77, mean (S.D) = 4.89(1.31)	TIS=-0.41($p<0.05$) OI=-0.37($p<0.05$) JC=-0.33($p<0.05$) TIS=0.59($p<0.05$) OI=0.43($p<0.05$) JC=0.42($p<0.05$) OI=0.57($p<0.05$) JC=0.44($p<0.05$) JC=0.36($p<0.05$) EL=-0.32($p<0.05$) TDS=-0.33 ($p<0.05$) OI=-0.29($p<0.05$) JC=-0.31($p<0.05$) TDS=0.70($p<0.05$) OI=0.42($p<0.05$) JC=0.40($p<0.05$) OI=0.45($p<0.05$) JC=0.37($p<0.05$) JC=0.34($p<0.05$)	Organizational Identification, Job Control, Trust in direct Supervisors

20. (Schlosser & Zolin, 2012)	Canada, Cross-Sectional, samples include over representation of public sector management in education and government, n= 142 (Supervisors) (male=47.9%, female=52.1%)	The aim of the author was to ask supervisors what help them to hear prosocial voice and notice defensive silence.	The results indicate that prosocial voice is increased by supervisor tension and trust in employees, while defensive silence is increased by supervisor tension but reduced by unionization of employees and trust in employees. This indicates that voice and silence are orthogonal and not opposites of the same construct.	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, OLS regression analysis	Prosocial Voice (PV), mean (S.D) = 3.9(0.71) Defensive Silence (DS), mean (S.D) = 2.4(0.98) Organizational Morale (OM) Armstrong-Stassen (1993, 2001) α = 0.897, mean (S.D) = 24(5.52) Positive Coping Skills (PCS) Latack et al. (1992) α = 0.74, mean (S.D) = 15.1(2.86) Trust in Subordinates (TIS) Rotter's (1967) α = 0.806, mean (S.D) = 16.1(2.25) Subordinates in Union (SIU) (dummy variable), mean (S.D) = 0.8(0.39) Supervisor's Tension (ST), mean (S.D) = 2.3(1)	DS=-0.27(p,0.05) OM=0.11 PCS=-0.02 TIS=0.62(p=0.001) SIU=0.02 ST=0.01 OM=-0.08 PCS=-0.08 TIS=-0.30 (p<0.001) SIU=-0.13 ST=0.28(p<0.001) PCS=0.04 TIS=0.08 SIU=0.27(p<0.001) ST=-0.04 TIS=0.15(p<0.10) SIU=0.02 ST=-0.04 SIU=-0.00 ST=-0.18(p<0.05) ST=0.04	Not reported
21. (Ju et al., 2019)	China, cross sectional and longitudinal, participants were from 19 MNC's in electronics, n= 3717 (mean (SD) organizational tenure = 4.97(3.87) years. Male (70.17%), bachelor degree (68.21%).	The main objective of this paper was to examine how and when leadership can reduce employee silence.	The results demonstrated that empowering leadership is associated with increased intrinsic motivation, which is in turn related to decreased employee silence. The findings also indicated that job autonomy strengthens the positive relationship between empowering leadership and intrinsic motivation and the indirect relationship between empowering leadership and employee silence.	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, Hierarchical multiple regression analysis.	Silence (SL) Tangirala and Ramanujam (2008) α = 0.90, mean (S.D) = 0.02(0.89) Intrinsic Motivation (IM) Warr et al. (1979) α = 0.89, mean (S.D) = 0.00(0.66) Empowering Leadership (EL) Ahearne et al. (2005) α = 0.94, mean (S.D) = 0.00(0.95) Job Autonomy (JA) Idaszak and Drasgow (1987) α = 0.87, mean (S.D) = 0.01(1.01)	IM=-0.217 (p<0.01) EL=-0.247(p<0.01) JA=-0.199(p<0.01) EL=0.426(p<0.01) JA=0.324(p<0.01) JA=0.532(p<0.01)	Moderator = Job autonomy Mediator= Intrinsic job Motivation
22. (Rhee, et al., 2016)	South Korea, cross sectional, participants were highly skilled employees	The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between	The findings indicated that power distance and collectivism induce relational	Pearson's correlation Coefficients,	Power distance (PD) Dorfman and Howell's (1988) α = 0.866, mean	C=0.187(p<0.01) RS=0.17(p<0.01) PS=0.079(p<0.05)	Mediator= Relational Silence

	of 35 heavy industry companies, n=732 (response rate was 63.4%, male=62.3%, female = 37.7%. With respect to age in years: Between 25 & 35 = 27.5% Between 36 & 45 = 42.9% Between 46 & 55 = 20% Between 56 & 65 = 9.6%	power distance, collectivism and relational silence; the associations between relational silence and stress; and the mediating role of relational silence in the link between power distance, collectivism and stress.	silence, relational silence increases stress and mediates the associations between power distance, collectivism and stress.	Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)	(S.D) = 3.332(1.144) Collectivism(C) Dorfman and Howell's (1988) α = 0.789, mean (S.D) = 3.208(1.133) Relational silence (RS) Brinsfield's (2013) α = 0.905, mean (S.D) = 3.294(1.181) Perceived stress (PS) Cohen et al. (1983) α = 0.938, mean (S.D) = 3.189(1.153)	 RS=0.165(p<0.01) PS=0.01(p>0.05) PS=0.189(p<0.01)	
23. (Dedahanov & Rhee, 2015)	South Korea, cross sectional, participants were highly skilled employees of heavy industry companies, n=753 (response rate was 71%, male=65.7%, female = 34.3%. With respect to age in years: Between 25 & 35 = 25.1% Between 36 & 45 = 44.4% Between 46 & 55 = 20.1% Between 56 & 65 = 10.5%	The purpose of the study was to investigate the impacts of trust in organization and trust in supervisor on acquiescent and defensive silence and examines the effects of acquiescent and defensive silence on organizational commitment.	The findings revealed that trust in organization is associated negatively with acquiescent silence, trust in supervisor is negatively related with defensive silence. Acquiescent and defensive silence demonstrated strong negative relationship with organizational commitment.	Pearson's correlation Coefficients, Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)	Trust in Organization (TIO) Cummings and Bromiley (1996) α = 0.827, mean (S.D) = 2.707(1.048) Trust in Supervisor (TIS) Robinson's (1996) α = 0.938, mean (S.D) = 2.624(1.191) Acquiescent Silence (AS) Van Dyne et al. (2003) α = 0.842, mean (S.D) = 3.384(1.064) Defensive Silence (DS) Van Dyne et al. (2003) α = 0.855, mean (S.D) = 3.486(1.063) Organizational Commitment (OC) Tsui et al. (1997) α = 0.872, mean (S.D) = 2.758(1.136)	AS=-0.096(p<0.01) OC=0.109(p<0.01) DS=-0.369 (p<0.01) OC=0.143(p<0.01) DS=0.078(p<0.05) OC=-0.178 (p<0.01) OC=-0.120 (p<0.01)	Mediator = Acquiescent Silence, Defensive Silence
24. (Fapohunda, 2016)	Nigeria, cross sectional, participants were from academic staff of Laos, Nigeria, n=321(response rate was 94.4%, male = 40.8%, female= 59.2%)	The purpose of the study was to examine the major determinants and consequences of employee silence and to offer ideas to surmount it.	The study found that most repeatedly cited motivations for silence were administrative beliefs, organizational practices and the fear of being labelled negatively, and subsequently damaging esteemed relationships. There was a significant relationship between organizational silence and emotional exhaustion; employee job	Pearson's correlation Coefficients	Organizational silence (OS) Emotional Fatigue (EF) Employee job dissatisfaction (EJD)	EF=0.982 (p<0.01) EJD=0.812(p<0.01) A=0.657(p<0.01) DIA=0.034(p>0.05) EJD=0.846(p<0.01) A=0.675(p<0.01) DIA=-0.018 (p>0.05) A=0.875(p<0.01) DIA=-0.323	Not reported

			dissatisfaction and apathy. However, the relationship between organizational silence and decreased individual achievement was not significant.		Apathy (A) Decreased individual achievement (DIA)	($p<0.01$) DIA=0.214 ($p<0.05$)	

4. RESEARCH GAP

In the light of the literature reviewed, it was found that very few studies have been conducted on employee silence and its related aspects in different countries. In the reviewed research studies, various dimensions of employee silence have not been included and analyzed, as some research had included unilateral construct and others partially studied the dimensions of employee silence. However, there is no such study that show the effect of organizational factors on employee silence and then the effect of employee silence on organization as well as on employees. Therefore, the proposed research will be focus on determining the dimensions of employee silence and various factors affecting employee silence and thus analyzing the effects of employee silence on organisation and employees in the service organizations particularly in the North India. Not even a single study is founded which focuses on the relationship of these all terms together at the same time.

5. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main aim of the research is to study the employee silence amongst employees in north India. However the specific objectives of the proposed research will be as under:

1) To discuss the different aspects and dimensions of employee silence to clarify this ambiguous construct.
2) To study the effect of organizational justice and workplace incivility on employee silence.
3) To study the relationship of employee silence with work outcomes and employees' behaviour.
4) To study the effect of employee silence on work outcomes and employees' behaviour.
5) To propose a model of employee silence to have improved working environment and favourable employee behaviour.

6. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Methodology is the specific procedure or technique used to identify, select process and analyse the information about a research problem. In a research paper, the methodology section allows the readers to critically evaluate the validity and reliability of the study. The methodology section answers two main questions. How would the data be collected and how is it be analysed? In the methodology process, the researchers acquire

deep knowledge about the problem and make conclusion for suggestions. So, it plays a vital role in research problem.

- **Research design**

  The research design is theoretical outline of the methods and techniques for collection, measurement and analysis of data. Exploratory-cum-descriptive research design will be used in the proposed study.

- **Population**

  The study will be conducted in north India. The employees of various organisations will be the target population.

- **Sampling design**

  The universe of the study is large enough and hence entire universe of the study cannot be surveyed. Hence keeping in view the different constrains of the research, the sample size of the study is proposed to 500 but it can be increased or decreased according to the requirement of the study.

- **Instrument**

  The present study calls for gathering primary data due to its specific requirements. The primary data will be collected with the help of well structured questionnaire.

- **Statistical techniques**

  Collected data will be analysed and interpreted with the help of statistical tools and techniques as per the requirement of the study.

7. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

1) **Introduction**

   In the first chapter, conceptual framework and objectives of study will be presented.

2) **Review of literature**

   In the second chapter, literature related to the concerned topic will be reviewed to acquaint ourselves with the present status of the research work in this area to support the present study.

3) **Research methodology**

This chapter would encompass the research design, research objective, research questions, hypothesis, sampling design, sample size, sample unit, nature of data and instruments to be used for data collection. It would also discuss at length the statistical technique that would be adopted to analyze the collected data.

4) **Analysis and interpretation**

This section will include analysis and interpretation of data to accomplish underlined objectives.

5) **Finding, conclusion and suggestion**

This chapter will summarize the research highlights. The significant theoretical and practical contributions would be presented. Finally, the thesis would conclude with discussions on the limitations of this study and suggestions on possible future research directions.

REFERENCES

Adamska, K., & Jurek, P. (2017). Adaptation of the Four Forms of Employee Silence Scale in a Polish sample. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, 4, 303–312.

Bagheri, G., Zarei, R., & Aeen, M. N. (2012). Organizational silence (basic concepts and its development factors). *Ideal Type of Management*, 1(1), 47–58.

Brinsfield, C. T. (2013). Employee silence motives: Investigation of dimensionality and development of measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(5), 671–697.

Chou, S. Y., & Chang, T. (2020). Feeling Capable and Worthy? Impact of Employee Silence on Self-Concept: Mediating Role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Psychological Reports*, 0(0),1-33, 003329412090184.

Dedahanov, A. T., Lee, D. H., & Rhee, J. (2016). Silence as a mediator between organizational factors and stress. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(8), 1251–1264.

Dedahanov, A. T., Lee, D., Rhee, J., & Yusupov, S. (2016). An examination of the associations among cultural dimensions, relational silence and stress. *Personnel Review*, 45(3), 593–604.

Dedahanov, A. T., & Rhee, J. (2015). Examining the relationships among trust, silence and organizational commitment. *Management Decision*, 53(8), 1843–1857.

Donaghey, J., Cullinane, N., Dundon, T., & Wilkinson, A. (2011). Reconceptualising employee silence: Problems and prognosis. *Work, Employment and Society*, 25(1), 51–67.

Dyne, L. V., Ang, S., & Botero, I. C. (2003). Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1359–1392.

Edwards, M., Ashkanasy, N. M. and Gardner, J. (2009). Deciding to speak up or to remain silent following observed wrongdoing: The role of discrete emotions and climate of silence. In Greenberg, J. and Edwards, M. (Ed.), *Voice and Silence in Organizations* Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing(pp. 83-109)

Erkutlu, H., & Chafra, J. (2018). Leader's integrity and employee silence in healthcare organizations. *Leadership in Health Services*, 32 (3), 419-434.

Erkutlu, H., & Chafra, J. (2019). Leader Machiavellianism and follower silence: The mediating role of relational identification and the moderating role of psychological distance. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 28(3), 323–342.

Fapohunda, T. N. (2016). Organizational silence: Predictors and consequences among university academic staff. *International Journal for Research in Social Science and Humanities Research*, 2(1), 83–103.

Haskins, M. E., & Freeman, R. E. (2015). What managers should never want to hear: Silence. *Management Decision*, 53(6), 1300–1311.

Hassan, S., DeHart-Davis, L., & Jiang, Z. (2019). How empowering leadership reduces employee silence in public organizations. *Public Administration*, 97(1), 116–131.

Hickland, E., Cullinane, N., Dobbins, T., Dundon, T., & Donaghey, J. (2020). Employer silencing in a context of voice regulations: Case studies of non-compliance. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(1), 1-16.

Huang, X., de Vliert, E. V., & der Vegt, G. V. (2005). Breaking the Silence Culture: Stimulation of Participation and Employee Opinion Withholding Cross-nationally. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(3), 459–482.

Jain, A. K. (2015). An interpersonal perspective to study silence in Indian organizations: Investigation of dimensionality and development of measures. *Personnel Review*, 44(6), 1010–1036.

Jena, L. K., Bhattacharyya, P., & Pradhan, S. (2017). Employee Engagement and Affective Organizational Commitment: Mediating Role of Employee Voice among Indian Service Sector Employees. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 21(4), 356–366.

Ju, D., Ma, L., Ren, R., & Zhang, Y. (2019). Empowered to Break the Silence: Applying Self-Determination Theory to Employee Silence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(485), 1-10.

Jung, H. S., & Yoon, H. H. (2019). The effects of social undermining on employee voice and silence and on organizational deviant behaviors in the hotel industry. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 29(2), 213–231.

Kish-Gephart, J. J., Detert, J. R., Treviño, L. K., & Edmondson, A. C. (2009). Silenced by fear:The nature, sources, and consequences of fear at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 29, 163–193.

Knoll, M., Hall, R. J., & Weigelt, O. (2019). A longitudinal study of the relationships between four differentially motivated forms of employee silence and burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 24(5), 572.

Knoll, M., & Van Dick, R. (2013). Do I hear the whistle…? A first attempt to measure four forms of employee silence and their correlates. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(2), 349–362.

KORKMAZ, E. (2018). The Relationship Between Organizational Silence and Allen-Meyer Organizational Commitment Model: A Research In The Health Sector In Turkey. *Bilecik Şeyh Edebali Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 3(1), 200–213.

Madrid, H. P., Patterson, M. G., & Leiva, P. I. (2015). Negative core affect and employee silence: How differences in activation, cognitive rumination, and problem-solving demands matter. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(6), 1887–1898.

Maqbool, S., Černe, M., & Bortoluzzi, G. (2019). Micro-foundations of innovation: Employee silence, perceived time pressure, flow and innovative work behaviour. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 22(1), 125–145.

Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1453–1476.

MOHSENI, S., KAHAKI, F., AHOEI, M., SANAGOO, A., HOSSEINZEHI, M., & MIRSHEKARI, L. (2016). The Relationship between Organizational Commitment and

Silence with Job Burnout in Medical Sciences Employees. *(Journal of Health Breeze) Family Health*, 5(2), 54-61.

Morrison, Elizabeth W. (2014). Employee Voice and Silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 173–197.

Morrison, Elizabeth Wolfe, & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational Silence: A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 706-725.

Nikolaou, I., Vakola, M., & Bourantas, D. (2011a). The role of silence on employees' attitudes "the day after" a merger. *Personnel Review*, 40(6), 723–741.

Pentilla, C. (2003), Get Talking, Entrepreneur, Nov, p 25.

Pinder, C. C., & Harlos, K. P. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20, 331–369.

Pirie, W. J. (2016). Key determinants of organisational silence for non-standard workers. *Management Decision*, 54(6), 1522–1538.

Pirzada, Z. A., Mirani, S. H., Phulpoto, N. H., Dogar, H., & Mahar, S. A. (2020). Study of Employee silence, Organizational Justice and Work Engagement: Mediation Analysis. *International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security*, 20(1), 9-14.

Rai, A., & Agarwal, U. A. (2017). Workplace bullying among Indian managers: Prevalence, sources and bystanders' reactions. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management*, 15(1), 58-81.

Rai, A., & Agarwal, U. A. (2018). Workplace bullying and employee silence: A moderated mediation model of psychological contract violation and workplace friendship. *Personnel Review*, 47(1),226-256.

Rayan, A. R. M., Ali, N. A. M., & Abdel Moneim, M. S. K. (2020). The Supervisor's Support For Silence And The Organizational Commitment: The Mediating Role Of Organizational Silence Behavior. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(2), 1-8.

Rhee, J., Dedahanov, A., & Lee, D. (2014). Relationships Among Power Distance, Collectivism, Punishment, and Acquiescent, Defensive, or Prosocial Silence. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 42(5), 705–720.

Schlosser, F., & Zolin, R. (2012). Hearing voice and silence during stressful economic times. *Employee Relations*, 34(5),555-573.

Srivastava, S., Jain, A. K., & Sullivan, S. (2019). Employee silence and burnout in India: The mediating role of emotional intelligence. *Personnel Review*, 48(4), 1045–1060.

Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2008). Employee Silence on Critical Issues: The Cross-Level Effects of Procedural Justice Climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(1), 37–68.

Tiitinen, L. (2020). The power of silence: Silencing as a method of preventing whistleblowing. *European Journal of Social Work*, 23(1), 68–79.

Vakola, M., & Bouradas, D. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of organisational silence: An empirical investigation. *Employee Relations*, 27(5), 441–458.

Wang, Y.-D., & Hsieh, H.-H. (2013). Organizational ethical climate, perceived organizational support, and employee silence: A cross-level investigation. *Human Relations*, 66(6), 783–802.

Whiteside, D. B., & Barclay, L. J. (2013). Echoes of silence: Employee silence as a mediator between overall justice and employee outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116(2), 251–266.

Zhan, M. (2020). When to speak up at work: A review of employee voice and silence behavior using a prospect approach. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 1–16.

Signature of Supervisor **Signature of Candidate**

Signature of Chairperson/Director